

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claim 2 is cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1 and 4 are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-9 are currently pending and under consideration in the present application.

**II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 2 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY UCHANSKI ET AL. (USP# 3,847,324)**

The present invention as recited in claim 1 (as amended herein), relates to a saucer to hold various kinds of cups and to be used with a microwave oven saucer holder provided on a microwave oven. The saucer comprises a cup seating part having a disc shape and engaging part to removably engage with the microwave oven saucer holder. The saucer is made of a transparent material and is provided on a transparent window of the microwave oven.

Uchanski discloses a nontipping, disposable dishware having a cup 13 and an improved plate 16. However, the plate 16 of Uchanski is not the same as a microwave oven saucer holder, and cannot be provided on a microwave oven like the claimed microwave oven saucer holder (see claim 1 of the present invention). Therefore, Uchanski does not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Claim 2 is cancelled herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 5-7 AND 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY MORGAN (USP# 5,873,486)**

Morgan discloses a selectively mountable cup holder. The Examiner indicates that Morgan discloses a mounting surface in column 2, line 23.

However, the mounting surface of Morgan is not the same as a microwave oven saucer holder, and cannot be provided on a microwave oven like the claimed microwave oven saucer holder recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Therefore, Morgan does not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Claims 3, 5-7 and 9 depend from claim 1. For at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 5-7 and 9 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 5-7 AND 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY McBRIDE (USP# 5,186,350)**

McBride discloses an insulated beverage container holder. The Examiner indicates that McBride discloses a mounting surface S and fasteners 54 and 56 (see column 4, lines 5-7).

However, the mounting surface S of McBride is not the same as a microwave oven saucer holder, and cannot be provided on a microwave oven like the claimed microwave oven saucer holder recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Therefore, McBride does not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Claims 3, 5-7 and 9 depend from claim 1. For at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 5-7 and 9 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**V. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 5 AND 6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY WEMYSS (USP# 6,305,656)**

Wemyss discloses a beverage cup holder 12 magnetically coupled to a magnetic base 14. However, the magnetic base 14 of Wemyss is not the same as a microwave oven saucer holder, and cannot be provided on a microwave oven like the claimed microwave oven saucer holder recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Therefore, Wemyss does not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Claims 3, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 5 and 6 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**VI. REJECTION OF CLAIM 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER McBRIDE OR WEMYSS IN VIEW OF THOMASON (USP# 5,102,086)**

The comments in section IV and V above, also apply here because claim 4 depends from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is

respectfully submitted that claim 4 also distinguishes over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**VII. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER WEMYSS IN VIEW OF McBRIDE**

The comments in section IV and V above, also apply here because claims 7-9 depend from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7-9 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

The Examiner indicates that claim 10 is rejected. However, claim 10 was cancelled in the previous response.

**VIII. CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-28-05

By:   
Derrick L. Fields  
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501